

Steens Mountain Advisory Council
Meeting Minutes
June 13 and 14, 2002

Members Present:

Jerry Sutherland, Vice Chair Environmental Representative – Statewide, Portland, Oregon
Alice Elshoff, Environmental Representative – Local, Frenchglen, Oregon
Hoyt Wilson, Grazing Permittee, Princeton, Oregon
E Ron Harding, Wild Horse Management, Burns, Oregon
Tom Harris, Chair, Mechanized or Consumptive Recreation, Keno, Oregon
Stacy Davies, Grazing Permittee, Frenchglen, Oregon
Harland Yriarte, Private Landowner, Eugene, Oregon
Wanda Johnson, Burns Paiute Tribe, Burns, Oregon
Jason Miner, Fish and Recreational Fishing, Portland, Oregon

Members Absent:

Cynthia Witzel, Recreational Permit Holder, Frenchglen, Oregon
Steve Purchase, State Liaison, Salem, Oregon
Thomas Wendel, Dispersed Recreation, Burns, Oregon

Designated Federal Official (DFO):

Miles Brown, Andrews Resource Area Field Manager, Bureau of Land Management, (BLM), Hines

Designated Federal Official Assistants:

Rhonda Karges, Management Support Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Liz Appelman, Budget Analyst, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Patti Wilson, Management Support Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon

Presenters:

Beth Coahran, Burns Paiute Tribe
Mark Sherbourne, Supervisory Natural Resource Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Gary Foulkes, District Planning & Environmental Coord., BLM, Hines, Oregon
Mary Emerick, Wilderness Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Evelyn Trieman, Outdoor Recreation Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Scott Thomas, District Archaeologist, BLM, Hines, Oregon

Facilitator:

Dale White

Commenting Public:

Susan Hammond, Hammond Ranches, Inc.
Clifford Volpe, Assistant Director, Steens Mountain Running Camp
Brent Fenty, Steens Wildland Coordinator, Oregon Natural Desert Association
Colby Marshall, Greg Walden's Office

Others Present: (Sign-in Sheet)

B. Marie Jarreau-Danner, Burns Times Herald
John Holt, Crooked River Ranch
Capital Press, Barb Cannady
Mark L. Armstrong, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Carolyn Freeborn, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Jennifer Thies, ERM, Reno, Nevada
Michael Weston, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Glen Patterson, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Tara Wilson, BLM, Hines, Oregon

Welcome, Introductions, Housekeeping, Agenda review:

Tom Harris called the meeting to order, each person introduced themselves, and minor adjustments were made to the agenda.

Chairman Update:

Congressional Hearing: Some concern was expressed for the lack of information available prior to the session itself. Miles acknowledged although people looked to the BLM for answers, the BLM had no control over the hearing and was an invited witness just like the rest of those testifying.

Jerry reiterated anyone wishing can submit written testimony for 30 days after the hearing. The group was provided the address, email and phone number of the appropriate recipient.

Wanda went on record stating the Burns Paiute Tribe received an invitation to the hearing on the Wednesday prior to it and this did not provide adequate notification. When responding back, the Burns Paiute Tribe was told it was too late to participate. The Burns Paiute Tribe wanted to be part of it and should have been, but without adequate notification this was not possible.

Stacy urged people to get in touch with the Congressionals whether it be to make comments or to let them know of concerns about who was not notified to testify.

Representation of the SMAC: Tom cautioned members to ensure when they are writing or being interviewed, they make it plain they are speaking for themselves or their constituents rather than for the SMAC.

Wilderness Access/Cooperative Management Agreement:

Jason Miner reviewed the information he had gathered from the environmental and conservation community concerning Cooperative Management Agreements (CMA) substituting for the normal BLM 2920 procedures for private inholding motorized access in wilderness. Jason was gathering information from these groups rather than representing them, as well as speaking with Brad Grenham on some of the same issues. The information received from those contacts is listed on the attached handout entitled “Steens Mountain Transportation Plan: Cooperative Management Agreements for Private Inholdings.”

Stacy noted one of the major concerns of the landowners is the access issues would then determine what the use of the property would be, which is a violation of landowner rights.

Members discussed the need to blend the intent of the Steens Act into the EAs and the various aspects of the same issues raised to the environmental and conservation members Jason spoke with.

Miles reported 26 letters had gone out informing inholders they needed to apply for motorized access if they needed it. Few replied. Under 2920 procedures he would have sent out a final letter giving notice that if no motorized access is requested, any motorized use will be a violation and subject to citations. This letter has been delayed in lieu of this discussion.

Issue: Is there a need for landowners to pay for a permit to access their private inholdings.

SMAC guidelines: All SMAC members agree there should be no fee.

Issue: Do permits need to be called permits?

Miles explained the difference between a CMA and a permit. A permit being BLM is authorizing someone to conduct an activity with perhaps some stipulations attached. While a CMA is more of a 2-way process, an agreement between two parties where both contribute to it.

As far as completing EAs, Miles explained while a CMA would be done with each landowner, it is possible a programmatic or collective EA could be done. He described the difference as being a programmatic EA would be generic in nature where as a collective EA would be more site-specific.

Jerry stated some of his constituents would have some concerns a CMA is outside the BLM's prescribed process for completing this, but he is willing to go along with it for now assuming it is legal.

Issue: The current permit of 3 years is too short and may serve to diminish the value of property rights. Is there another way?

Members discussed what would trigger a reevaluation, if it isn't based on a certain number of years. It was agreed if a change in access requires a significant physical change to the road which may have adverse impact to the wilderness values, a renegotiation would occur. The other possibility could be a change in ownership; however, this could also be merely a reassignment of the CMA depending on the circumstances.

Issue: NEPA analysis is offensive to some landowners. Why does reasonable use need to be subject to a public process which is subject to appeal?

SMAC members discussed the necessity of including the Steens Act intent as well as purposes into any NEPA document. Jerry suggested those items found to be discretionary after reviewing the Wilderness Act and existing regulations could be considered in conjunction with the Steens Act.

Stacy continues to object to the NEPA documentation for access, but for the purposes of this process we are hearing enough people say NEPA has to be done; however, completion of NEPA should be done creatively according to the Steens Act.

Harland expressed the concern of many who live and work on the Mountain the Bureaucracy, over time, will mandate how they live their lives.

SMAC members agreed NEPA has to be done, but will also take into account the purposes of the Steens Act.

Issue: The concept of applying for "permission" or a permit for reasonable access governing private rights is offensive.

SMAC members believe this is up to the landowners whether or not they want to go through the process, and whether or not to take it to court if need be. This is a question that will have to be answered rather than the SMAC determining possible guidelines.

Motion made.

Discussion: Because this is not a recommendation a vote is not necessary. Jason withdrew the motion and the second, Alice, agreed to the withdrawal.

Action Followup: Harland will take these sideboards/guidelines to the landowners for further discussion.

The next step after this is if the landowners are interested, they would come back to the BLM by mid-July with a potential CMA, and that would start the NEPA process. If the CMA is not accepted by the next SMAC meeting, BLM would proceed with the final 2920 letter.

Public Comments:

Brent Fenty, ONDA, suggested SMAC members consider writing a letter in support of the reappointment of those members whose terms are up in August. He believed the Council had made good progress coming together and would like to see the members continue on with the work.

Susie Hammond, Hammond Ranches, Inc., stated she heard the group talking about the Wilderness Act, the Steens Act and other regulations but no one really speaking to the rights of the private property owner as covered by the Constitution. Even if the land use must be readdressed, the government agency should not be able to take private property and devalue it by not providing access. Historic uses are protected with the Act and during its entire inception they were told private property was not going to be affected. The Act protected economic businesses but with the possible changes in property access this may not be the case any longer. As a private landowner Susie wants one CMA to include everything foreseeable, should be initiated by BLM, and BLM needs to communicate better what is being done. Time to private landowners is dollars.

Miles read a letter from Mrs. Paul C. Sheeline, New York. She supports a strong and literal interpretation of the Wilderness Act and regulations. She wants the Wilderness managed according to those laws with no exceptions.

John Holt, interested citizen, expressed appreciation for the job this group has ahead of it and was impressed with how the group goes about doing business. He noted he had applied for one of the positions on the Council and was attending the meeting to gather more information.

Additional discussion on CMAs:

Jason wanted to let the members know Brad Grenham, Solicitor's Office, had said if for whatever reason the CMA approach becomes unworkable, the 2920 approach is still available. Miles clarified Brad's role as one of advisor rather than approving authority.

Off-Road Administrative Access (Maintenance of Agricultural Facilities):

Jerry raised the question regarding heavy machinery used off-road for construction in the Gap Reservoir EA. Section 112 of the Act prohibits off-road vehicle travel within the CMPA, but outside the Steens Mountain Wilderness, with exceptions. Those exceptions being if the Secretary determines the use falls under certain categories such as administrative, emergency, etc. Miles explained the Andrews Field Manager represents the Secretary to make this determination. Jerry asked how the criteria would be set for determining if off-road use is warranted. Stacy explained grazing permittees have a cooperative agreement written in their permits where they maintain the facilities and this should be considered permission under the current guidelines. Miles said this constituted the authority referred to in the Act. This would be addressed in the RMP.

Transportation

Tom Harris reviewed the information available for a transportation plan, leading the group in a discussion on how to accomplish the delineating of all the routes in existence on a map of the area and generally the types of existing routes. Some of the things to be considered in the transportation plan are why the route is needed, what are the restrictions, what kind of uses the route will be serving, what is the possible maintenance needs, and if the route is necessary or not? One of the concerns SMAC members need to be sensitive to during this process is any changes that would move activities to private lands thus increasing the pressure on those lands.

Stacy reviewed the preliminary categories the landowners had brainstormed and they had talked outside the Wilderness area the current routes would remain open. The landowners believe every route should be considered seasonal and should be considered for seasonal closures. The categories are subject to refinement and changes as this process progresses.

The categories include:

- Seasonal closure route - mainly occur on public land.
- Cooperatively managed route - runs across public to private to public or across private to public, it is one the private landowners agree to allow public on. Where it is cooperatively managed, both entities have rights to close it seasonally for various reasons or to close it to certain types of vehicles.
- Service and Permit Use Route - Historically, this route would have been called administrative, used only by the agency or someone to whom that agency issues a permit.
- Private route -totally on private land. There is some concern as to whether or not to even display private routes on a BLM map, because some public believe if the route is displayed, they can use it and this is not necessarily the case.

- Private property access route - goes across public land to access private land. If it is under this category the general public will know the purpose for which it is being traversed.

Another part of the proposal would be to mark the route open to the public in one color and those closed in a different color. Some areas need to be identified where people pull off the route to park or to camp. These have existed for years but were not identified in any inventory and it is a problem that needs to be addressed. One part of the proposal could be to cross hatch those areas, monitor them and if impacts to resources occur, they could be closed if necessary. This might be exchanged for rehabilitating routes that had been bladed in WSAs post FLPMA.

SMAC members discussed various aspects of the definitions and possible means of refining them, as well as the fact the cooperatively managed routes would allow help for the BLM in monitoring use of them. The planning process would be the means of detailing the criteria for such things as closure, seasonal closure, administrative access, etc.

A lengthy discussion of maintenance, the necessity, scope and extent that might be necessary ensued. How to develop which categories routes fit into, how to differentiate the levels of maintenance needed, as well as how to remain within the governing laws. Jerry pointed out and Mark Sherbourne confirmed with reference materials, all routes within WSAs are called ways and cannot be maintained unless an EA establishes it as necessary to protect wilderness values. The term “route” is being used in this discussion instead of “s” to avoid having to make this distinction in every sentence.

Four possible categories for maintenance were deemed to be: 2 track routes not maintained; 2-track routes created with machinery and can be maintained; primary access routes and high class routes such as the Loop Road and Moon Hill road.

Members discussed a possible group and named specific people who could be involved.

Wanda expressed concern with the way SMAC was determining who would work on the process, naming individuals to work on it.

SMAC decided the best approach would be to have an ad hoc group of SMAC members, members of the environmental community, interested general public, those with knowledge of the Mountain, landowners, and BLM employees to participate in a group that would put information down on a map and bring it all back to the SMAC. No decisions of any kind will be made by the group gathering the information. Tom Harris volunteered to lead the group and Mark Sherbourne will be the BLM contact.

Members acknowledge ground-truthing will need to be accomplished once all the routes are identified. Miles told the group since currently motorized/mechanized vehicles are prohibited off designated routes or trails, there will have to be specific designations on a map in order for these types of conveyance to operate anywhere within the CMPA.

Cultural and Tribal Concerns

Beth Coahran from the Burns Paiute Tribe presented to the group a glimpse of the Burns Paiute Tribe's concerns relating to the Steens. Beth described the significance and importance the Steens plays in the lives of tribal members and their history on the Mountain. Elders are joyous of having access to the SMAC. Beth also discussed concerns of cultural/heritage, botanical, cultural fisheries, and wildlife resources, permitted uses, roads/access, verbiage in documents, and the potential influx of people.

Cultural/Heritage

Cultural resources or heritage resources to the Burns Paiute Tribe is an unbroken continuum that fully encompasses today as yesterday and fully extends into tomorrow. The Burns Paiute Tribe would like some type of agreement or contract to work with BLM on Section 106 clearances. Scott Thomas explained they are not considered a small business, so BLM cannot contract with them directly. Burns Paiute Tribe may want to set up a non-profit, small business to conduct Section 106 clearances or apply to work for BLM directly. Burns Paiute Tribe would look for more than lithic scatters. Tom Harris asked if SMAC could help?

Botanical:

The Burns Paiute Tribe would like a list of cultural plants in the management plan. Noxious weed abatement should be coordinated with the Burns Paiute Tribe to avoid important cultural plant sites. Toxic residue is harmful if consumed.

Fisheries & Wildlife:

Fish have always been an important resource and several wildlife species are traditional food sources and are eaten throughout the year.

Permitted Use & Roads/Access:

Want to ensure the restriction of access is coordinated with the Burns Paiute Tribe. A major concern is the ability to transport elders who are less mobile if roads are closed to continue historical practices.

Education/Information Disbursal and Verbiage:

The Burns Paiute Tribe would like a full hand in the education and information disbursal to the public. Signs need to be in English and Paiute (Paiute transcribed to English not English transcribed to Paiute). Would like to review and add to brochures. Refer to the Burns Paiute Tribe as such and not just Tribe. Tribe refers to other tribes not just Burns Paiute Tribe. BLM will use "Burns Paiute Tribe and

other Tribes” to highlight their relative proximity to the Steens and that they were specifically named in the Act. Alice wondered if we are alienating other Tribes if we specify Burns Paiute Tribe in our documents and not specifically name other tribes?

Influx of People

The Burns Paiute Tribe is really concerned with the increasing level of looting and vandalism. Beth thinks the greater number of people on the Mountain, the more chance looting and vandalism will occur. Those people who wish to participate in activities not in line with the Wilderness Act, who may chose to move those activities to the environment surrounding the Wilderness, could have a large and very detrimental effect to important sacred sites.

A conversation ensued about the concern about limiting the number of people in wilderness. Harland asked what happens if the tribe wants to have a big meeting in Big Indian or other wilderness areas with 2,000-3,000 people? Jerry would have to check the regulations and see the position of his constituents. Miles referred to the section in the Act regarding the Burns Paiute Tribe’s traditional access to the Steens (including Wilderness area).

Wanda shared the ties with other Tribes were that many Paiute people were originally from this area but because of hostile times fled to other areas and now reside on other reservations.

It was suggested that Harland should have the Burns Paiute Tribe make presentations or demonstrations at Running Camp activities or demonstrations.

Scott Thomas, District Archaeologist, spoke to the group regarding Cultural Resource Management within the CMPA. Scott addressed sites types, current management, data gaps and public education. Less than 5% of the CMPA has been inventoried with 185 sites recorded.

Native American Traditional and Religious Use Areas:

Scott shared with the group that little is known of present-day traditional uses or religious use of the Steens, but many economically important plants grow there and are threatened by juniper and weed encroachment and it is assumed the Mountain was important in ancient times as a storehouse.

Historic and Prehistoric Sites

Many sites are old refuse scatters and are found in project clearance inventories. Remnants of the past include aspen Arborglyphs (tree carvings), cabins, shacks and old roads. The Riddle Brothers Ranch is a National Historic District (restoration efforts continue). The majority of prehistoric sites are waste flake scatters produced by tool making. Discovering and documenting prehistoric village sites is

a major program focus for BLM. Some sites are pecked designs (petroglyphs) and are fragile and susceptible to weathering and vandalism.

Paleontology

A well described plant fossil locality, dating back 21 million years, exists east of the Steens and potential vertebrate fossil localities exist in the southeast corner of the CMPA.

Impacts to Sites

Site damage occurs from erosion, livestock trampling, vandalism/looting, road construction, rangeland projects, recreation activities, off-highway vehicles and archaeological research.

Site Management & Protection

Site management consists of protection, inventory, excavation, site recording, and restoration. Protection measures include removing the impact, recovering the data, signing, fencing, land acquisitions, volunteer caretakers and monitoring. Four major archaeological sites have been partially excavated in the last seven years.

Paleo-environmental Reconstruction

Pollen coring reveals the changes in plant communities, climate and climatic fluctuations. Pack rat middens analysis is a way to interpret the change and locations of plant communities. They augment the pollen record. Tephra (volcanic ash) deposits are well documented time markers that help interpret erosion and deposition cycles.

There is no specific knowledge of Tribal use within the CMPA and an oral history from Tribal elders and historic users is lacking. Interpretative subjects are numerous and on-going.

An outline of Beth's presentation and Scott's PowerPoint presentation were handed out to the SMAC.

June 14, 2002

Introductions and Questions from Thursday:

The meeting was called to order and introductions made.

Question and Answers, Comments from Yesterday

Council members asked to have the information from the cultural resource information presentations as well as the discussion that followed be incorporated in

the minutes. It was determined a mistake was made and no recording or note taking was done for either the presentation or the discussion. The presentations themselves are available on hard copy, and any member with notes from the discussion was asked to make them available so they could be included in the minutes (presentations attached to official file copy).

Alice requested in response to the Burns Paiute Tribal presentation and the concerns raised, the SMAC write a letter to the Secretary recommending it be ensured coordination on any management projects be done on a government to government basis. Although Miles reassured Alice this is what currently happens, she felt there were terrible gaps in the dealings with the Burns Paiute Tribe, as shown by the lack of adequate prior notice for the hearings, and she, as a SMAC member, would like to be able to respond to some of the Burns Paiute Tribe's concerns.

Wanda expressed the hurt felt by her People from the absence of note taking or recording of the cultural presentations as well as the Legislators failing to allow the Burns Paiute Tribe to participate in the hearings. This land under discussion is the motherland of her People and they have great love and respect for it. When her People are treated with indifference or not asked or allowed to participate, it hurts her People deeply. Tribal concerns of not being able to access lands for traditional gatherings, safety, Tribal members should be allowed the same rights as others, and not have their time upon the Mountain disturbed, their historical uses should be protected. Wanda said although they had been allowed to have input (like her presence here at the table); there is a lack of acknowledgment the Burns Paiute Tribe is a sovereign nation and should be treated as such.

Miles apologized for the lack of note taking and Rhonda apologized for the error made in not recording the session.

Alice felt there should be more than it just appearing in the record and wanted a strong response to the concerns that have been expressed by the Burns Paiute Tribe over a period of time. She felt the break down in communication from the legislative offices to the Burns Paiute Tribe was unconscionable. She felt an important component of this was to let BLM know that SMAC members expect the Burns Paiute Tribe to be treated the same as any other government entity.

Stacy stated the SMAC could write a letter highlighting the portions of the Act and discuss Tribal concerns and another to thank the tribe for giving the presentation and to encourage them to participate any time. He had not heard the Burns Paiute Tribe asking for special privileges but rather to be treated on an even level, which they did not believe had happened to date. Stacy stated the presentations had given him much information he previously did not know, and they had opened his eyes to numerous things. Stacy asked Wanda to further explain why she was uncomfortable with the way the ad-hoc committee was being set up for the transportation plan.

Wanda said everyone was here with their own interests, but this group needs to work together and come up with a solution. In regards to those working on identifying roads within the CMPA, she was uncomfortable with picking others because there are so very many people with an interest or concern about the Mountain, and they don't have the opportunity to be handpicked to help. She believes the Council has the ability and one representative should be able to work with another to understand what is going on and to work on that group. The SMAC itself should come up with the solutions. She felt if it was going to be a group, then it should be open to whomever is interested and participants should not be handpicked.

Miles noted the local office is working with the Burns Paiute Tribe to complete the necessary paperwork to include them as a partner and to participate right on the RMP ID Team.

Stacy talked of how to balance notifying people of meetings and their opportunity to participate while moving forward gathering information. Ron added to this wondering what the best means of notification could be. Jerry felt the local radio announces it as does the Burns Times Herald, and it does go out further in the state. All members appeared to have wrestled with this balance.

Tom stated the work on the route/transportation maps will be done the last week in June and the first week in July, anyone wishing to participate is welcome to attend. Jerry suggested once the meeting dates are set and what section will be worked on the Burns Paiute Tribe would be notified and they could determine if their representative should attend.

The members reiterated this group is to gather factual information and return information to the SMAC for any decisions that need to be made.

Action Followup Item: BLM will write an apology for the lack of note taking and recording at this meeting. Alice will craft a letter for the SMAC to endorse with a copy to the Oregon delegation addressing these concerns and inviting the delegation to respond to the question of not having issued a timely invitation for the Burns Paiute Tribe to participate at the Frenchglen meeting.

Review and Approve April Minutes:

Motion made and seconded: To pass the minutes as corrected and adjusted (Jerry made, Stacy seconded)

Discussion: Jerry stated it looked like he and Tom were the only ones commenting on the minutes and they had a disagreement on whether or not to include the word "motorized" under the Cooperative Management Agreement discussion. Members discussed the intent of the section.

Consensus Decision: Amend original motion to include the word motorized in the four places Miles is discussing the issue. (Stacy moved, Jerry seconded)

Agenda items: Due to Tom's departure the group discussed the agenda. It was decided the SRP EAs would be given to SMAC members for an "internal review" prior to the August meeting. This review would be prior to the 30-day public comment period.

A major part of the August meeting will be to work on the Transportation Plan and go on to Recreation.

Planning Updates:

Gary Foulkes reported the comments received from scoping are being processed. Contractors have assembled the comments, summarized and categorized them and numbered them so they can be cross referenced to the actual letter. Comments are being reviewed to see if any new issues or concerns have been raised. Gary outlined the alternatives, goals, objectives and management actions. Members discussed the ways the final decisions are made, how much the National Landscape Conservation System Office is dictating what must be done, how to ensure the Steen Act is incorporated into the document, mailing list requirements, budget needs, pressures that will be placed by different sides and the presence of Cooperators working with the ID team.

SMAC members were asked to get any comments on the alternatives, goals, and objectives back to Gary by June 21.

Gary stated that Sept 23-27 in Boise will be a course called "Successful Land Use Planning", and he urged SMAC members to attend if they could.

Public Comment:

Susie Hammond., Hammond Ranches, Inc. could sympathize with where Wanda is coming from concerning how things are moving fast and a lot of the private landowners don't know what is going on. Time for involvement is money to the private landowners and that needs to be taken into consideration. Susie asked if there was any money provided to Council members to aid in keeping everyone informed. She stated she heard the City of Burns named as a possible cooperator and asked that the City of Hines also be considered. She also asked if the mailing list that was getting too long included private landowners.

Miles responded letters had gone out to all government entities and perhaps he would contact the City of Hines as a follow up to see if they wished to be involved. He also expressed the concern about people outside the Steens such as in the Catlow, Alvord, Trout Creek and Pueblo areas.

Colby Marshall, Representative Walden's natural resources staff person who is stationed in Bend, introduced himself to the group. He grew up in Harney County and is very familiar with the issues of the area. He stated the Congressman sends his deep appreciation of the work this group is doing and he stands ready to help in any way. Colby was hired and placed in the Bend office to have greater access to Eastern Oregon and to work on the issues facing this group and Harney County. He will be the on-the-ground person for issues dealing with the Steens. He thanked those who testified and relayed the Congressman was happy with the outcome of that hearing and the conversation it spurred. The Congressman encourages everyone to remember the intent of the Act which is to maintain the historical, economic, cultural uses and to provide access to interested parties to the Mountain. Colby provided the group his phone number and email address.

Peter Green, Governor's Office, stated the Governor will continue to pay close attention to the progress on implementation as indicated by the letter recently sent to the BLM. He pointed out the Act also was intended to protect the environment. He reiterated the historical uses as described in the Act are protected.

Cliff Volpe, Steens Mountain Running Camp Associate Director, suggested SMAC members may consider calling people on the phone if there is a special interest group out there feeling they are being left out. A phone call might be more personal and keep everyone informed.

Action Follow-up Item: Miles will contact the City of Hines to see if they wish to be involved as a cooperating agency.

Wilderness Program Update:

Mary Emerick suggested the SMAC consider using a sub-committee for LAC. There is a need to identify the different management zones on a map. Mary has created some preliminary ones with some draft indicators, but more definite ones are necessary. She would need comments back by June 30.

Mary informed the group she will be moving to Tongas National Forest. Council members expressed their appreciation for Mary's work on the sensitive issues of the Wilderness Program. Because several key recreation representatives are absent, the information will be sent to them to ensure their comments can be received by the deadline.

Recreation Use Monitoring (RMIS Data Sheet):

Evelyn reviewed the handout concerning recreation data that was given the group at the last meeting. Data has to be entered into RMIS in order to provide information required and Evelyn acknowledged the need to adjust some of the formulas within RMIS. Her main reason for sharing the information was to show the group the increases taking place in recreation on the Mountain. Dates for the random

sampling were discussed and Stacy urged that perhaps one of the higher use holidays or the hunting season should be used to show the impact of those days. He also recommended reading the counters the day before and after a big event to give peak numbers.

DFO Update:

Walden/Wyden Hearing: Miles reviewed the earlier discussion as well as summarized the events of the hearing for those people who were absent.

SRP EAs: Miles asked if the group would wish to see them prior to the EAs being sent to the public. Harland would go along with the majority, Jerry wanted to just get them out to the public, and the remaining six members (Hoyt, Stacy, Wanda, Alice, Jason, and Ron) wanted to see them all. These are draft, working, internal documents and should remain with SMAC members only.

Miles reported that a new State Director will be reporting to Oregon soon, she is Elaine Marquis-Brong who is currently the Director of the NLCS office.

Miles reported the SMAC nominations will be forward to the Secretary's office, and is hoping the appointments are completed prior to the August meeting.

Motion made and seconded.

Discussion: Members discussed writing a letter in support of those currently on the SMAC who applied for reappointment, as well as urging the Secretary to get the appointments done quickly.

Consensus Decision: Jason will write a letter in support of those three individuals currently serving that have reapplied and to urge the Secretary to complete the appointments prior to the August 14 meeting. (Jason moved, Jerry seconded.)

Action Followup Item: Jason to write letter and send to Rhonda for Tom Harris' signature and mailing.

Miles reported, because of the heavy workload and complexity of a lot of the recreation issues that are facing the District, the State Director has loaned the District a position. The position will be filled by Mr. Jon Collins who comes to us from Safford Arizona and is an Outdoor Recreation Planner with extensive experience in wilderness. He will be replacing Mark Sherbourne as a supervisor over the recreation/wilderness program in the Andrews Resource Area. Mark Sherbourne will be working on the transportation plan and helping with the heavy workload in the Realty Program.

Miles informed the Council this would be his last meeting since he has taken a job in the State Office as the State Weed Coordinator and will be working on the Great

Basin Restoration Initiative as well. Council members thanked Miles for the work he has done.

Tom Harris and Miles suggested a thank you letter be sent to Tom Wendel for his contributions to the SMAC.

Meeting Critique:

All members felt the meeting was probably one of the most successful and were quite pleased with it. Members seem to be making progress gaining trust with each other and being able to work through some of the tough issues while ensuring feelings are also taken into consideration.

Agenda Items for August Meeting: Covered earlier except there will be a tour on the day prior to the meeting. Miles will be getting information out to members firming up the possible departure times and where the tour will go.

Action Items were reviewed and Updated.

Adjourned

Submitted by Liz Appelman

The SMAC approved the meeting minutes as amended on August 16, 2002.

Certified by:

Tom Harris, SMAC Chair

August 16, 2002